

Serial No. **10/026,520**

Docket No. **P-0315**

Amdt. dated July 20, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 3 and 8 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 12 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13 and 15 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,522 (Flynn) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art in Figs. 1-4 and Background of the Background Art (APA) and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0089958 (Feder et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,988,146 (Magret et al.).

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview held on June 7, 2006. At the interview, agreement was reached that the claim amendments incorporated herein overcome the cited references.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of APA, Feder et al. and Magret et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 1, 7 and 12, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the

combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, a home agent that generates and transmits a registration release message to the first foreign agent, upon receipt of the registration request message from the mobile node sent via the second foreign agent directly to the HA, when the handoff takes place, or the home agent setting the life time field of the registration release message to the value of 0 causing the first foreign agent to delete prior registration information of the mobile node, stored in at least a visitor table, after receipt of the registration release message. The Examiner admits that neither Flynn nor APR disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Feder discloses these limitations in paragraphs 326, 330, and 331, and Magret et al. at col. 14, lines 55-61 and col. 17, lines 50-55 and col. 25, lines 5-8. However, these portions of Feder et al., merely disclose that a new AP creates new entries in its connection table after receiving a registration request and relays the registration message to its wireless hub and that the old AP deletes the connection entry from its connection table, that the registration server sends a release message to the old wireless hub, and that when an advertisement is received from a new wireless hub the end system sends a message to request a network layer registration to the registration server where the registration request is relayed from the new AP to the new wireless hub to the registration server. Further, the cited portions of Magret et al. merely disclose that in any binding update message sent by the mobile node's home agent, the lifetime should be set equal to zero, and a definition of the lifetime bit where a lifetime of 0 indicates that a previous subscription will be canceled. This is not a home agent that generates and transmits a

registration release message to the first FA, upon receipt of the registration request message from the mobile node sent via the second FA, when the handoff takes place, as recited in the claims of the present application. Feder et al. merely discloses an access point deleting connection information from the table. As shown in figures 4 and 5, the access point in Feder may reside at the base station or remotely. An access point is not a home agent or a foreign agent as recited in the claims of the present application. According to embodiments of the present invention, a foreign agent provides a mobile internet IP service to the mobile node. Therefore, Feder et al. does not disclose or suggest a home agent generating and transmitting a registration release message to a first foreign agent, upon receipt of the registration request message from the mobile node sent via the second foreign agent, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Feder et al. merely discloses a registration server sending a release message to an old wireless hub located at a base station. This is not a home agent generating and transmitting a registration release message upon receipt of a registration request message from the mobile node sent via a second foreign agent directly to the HA, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Moreover, the cited portions of Feder et al. or Magret et al. do not disclose or suggest the home agent setting the life time field of the registration release message to the value of 0 causing the first foreign agent to delete prior registration information of the mobile node, after receipt of the registration release message. Magret et al. merely discloses the well known definition of the

function of the lifetime field function. None of the cited references disclose or suggest a home agent setting the life time field of the registration release message to the value of 0 causing a first foreign agent to delete prior registration information of the mobile node. According to the limitations in the claims of the present application, after receipt of a registration release message at home agent from the mobile node sent via a second foreign agent, the home agent generates and transmits a registration release message to the first foreign agent, when the handoff takes place, and then sets the life time field of the registration release message to 0. These limitations are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references.

In addition, Applicant submits that there would be no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Feder et al. with Magret et al. and the other cited references in an attempt to achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. For example, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a home agent, a first foreign agent that provides an IP service to a mobile node, and a second foreign agent that provides a IP service to the mobile node. The combination of Feder et al. (which merely discloses access points providing information to a wireless hub in a base station) with Magret et al. (which merely discloses definition of the lifetime field), have little to do with each other and the combination provides no benefits. Further, this combination does not achieve the limitations in the claims of the present application. For these reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine these references.

Serial No. **10/026,520**

Docket No. **P-0315**

Amdt. dated July 20, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

Regarding claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent one of independent claims 1, 7 and 12 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13 and 15 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/026,520**

Docket No. **P-0315**

Amdt. dated July 20, 2006

Reply to Office Action of February 27, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11-13 and 15 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: July 20, 2006

\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-257\88182.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610